













DR. NEWMAN  
ON  
ANGLICAN ORDERS,  
IN A LETTER

ADDRESSED TO FATHER COLERIDGE.

WITH A REPLY

BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

(Reprinted from the *Rock* newspaper.)

---

Matt. vii. 1, 5.

---

Detrahere aliquid alteri, et hominem hominis incommodo suum augere commodum, magis est contra naturam quàm mors, quàm paupertas, quàm dolor, quàm cætera quæ possunt aut corpori accidere, aut rebus externis.—*Cicero*.

---

LONDON: WILLIAM MACINTOSH,  
24, PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

1868.

Price 2s. 6d.,

# DR. NEWMAN AND HIS RELIGIOUS OPINIONS.

A CRITICAL REVIEW AND EXAMINATION OF  
DR. NEWMAN'S RECENT WORKS.

BY C. H. COLLETTE.

---

This Work exposes the shallow arguments and sophistry of modern  
Perverts to Romanism.

---

LONDON:  
JOHN F. SHAW AND CO.,  
48, PATERNOSTER ROW.

---

☞ When Dr. Newman went over to Rome it was publicly stated in the papers that he was not re-ordained. This implied that he was already an ordained Priest of Rome while in the Anglican Church. The statement was allowed to circulate without contradiction, as far as I have been able to discover. I accepted it therefore, as a fact, and twice referred to it in the above work. Dr. Newman has, however, in consequence, written to a kindred spirit still in the Church he has quitted, declaring that he was re-ordained. I accept this *as a fact*, and beg my readers to do the same.



# DR. NEWMAN TO FATHER COLERIDGE

ON

## ANGLICAN ORDERS.

---

“Ita comparatam esse naturam omnium, aliena ut melius videant et dijudicent, quam sua.”\*—TERENCE.

---

The following is extracted from the *Catholic Opinion* of 5th September, 1868:—

“The *Month* for September has an article on Anglican Sacerdotalism well worth reading: at the end of it the editor gives a valuable letter from Dr. Newman on Anglican Orders.

“The passage to which the question answered in the letter of Dr. Newman refers is the following, which we give here for the convenience of our readers. Dr. Newman is speaking of the Establishment:—

“‘As to its possession of an episcopal succession from the time of the Apostles, well, it may have it, and if the Holy See ever so decided, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own; but, for myself, I must have St. Philip’s gift, who saw the sacerdotal character on the forehead of a gaily attired youngster, before I can by my own wit acquiesce in it, for Antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts.’—*Apologia*, Appendix, p. 26 (1st edition).

“‘The Oratory, Birmingham,  
“August 5, 1868.

“‘My dear Father Coleridge,

“‘You ask me what I precisely mean, in my *Apologia*, Appendix, p. 26, by saying, *à propos* of Anglican Orders, that

---

\* The nature of all men is so formed, that they see and discriminate in the affairs of others better than their own.

‘Antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts.’ I will try to explain:—

“‘I. The inquiry into Anglican Orders has ever been to me of the class which I must call dreary; for it is dreary surely to have to grope into the minute intricate passages and obscure corners of past occurrences, in order to ascertain whether this man was ever consecrated, or that man used a valid form, or a certain sacramental intention came up to the mark, or the report or register of an ecclesiastical act can be cleared of suspicion. On giving myself to consider the question, I never have been able to arrive at anything higher than a probable conclusion, which is most unsatisfactory except to Antiquarians, who delight in researches into the past for their own sake.

“‘II. Now, on the other hand, what do I mean by ‘visible facts’? I mean such definite facts as throw a broad antecedent light upon what may be presumed, in a case in which sufficient evidence is not forthcoming. For instance—

“‘(1.) The Apostolical Succession, its necessity, and its grace, is not an Anglican tradition, though it is a tradition found in the Anglican Church. By contrast, our Lord’s Divinity is an Anglican tradition—every one, high and low, holds it. It is not only in Prayer-book and Catechism, but in the mouths of all professors of Anglicanism. Not to believe it is to be no Anglican; and any persons in authority, for 300 years, who were suspected to doubt or explain it away, were marked men, as Dr. Colenso is now marked. And they have been so few that they could be counted. Not such is the Apostolical Succession; and, considering the Church is the *columna et firmamentum veritatis*, and is ever bound to stir up the gift that is in her, there is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have. I wonder how many of its Bishops and Deans hold the doctrine at this time; some who do not, occur to the mind at once. One knows what was the case thirty or forty years ago by the famous saying of Blomfield, Bishop of London.

“‘(2.) If there is a true succession, there is a true

Eucharist; if there is not a true Eucharist, there is no true succession. Now, what is the presumption here? I think it is Mr. Alexander Knox who says or suggests that, if so great a gift *be* given, it must have a *custos*. Who is the *custos* of the Anglican Eucharist? The Anglican clergy? Could I, without distressing or offending an Anglican, describe what sort of *custodes* they have been, and are, to their Eucharist? ‘*O bone custos,*’ in the words of the poet, ‘*cui commendavi Filium Meum!*’ Is it not charitable towards the bulk of the Anglican clergy to hope, to believe, that so great a treasure has not been given to their keeping? And would our Lord leave Himself for centuries in such hands? Inasmuch then as ‘the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ’ in the Anglican communion is without protective ritual and jealous guardianship, there seems to me a strong presumption that neither the real gift, nor its appointed guardians, are to be found in that communion.

“(3.) Previous baptism is the condition of the valid administration of the other sacraments. When I was in the Anglican Church, I saw enough of the lax administration of Baptism even among High Churchmen, though they did not of course intend it, to fill me with great uneasiness. Of course there are definite persons whom one might point out, whose baptisms are sure to be valid. But my argument has nothing to do with *present* baptisms. Bishops were baptised, not lately, but as children. The present Bishops were consecrated by other Bishops, they again by others. What I have seen in the Anglican Church makes it very difficult for me to deny that every now and then a Bishop was a consecrator who had never been baptised. Some Bishops have been brought up in the north as Presbyterians, others as Dissenters, others as Low Churchmen, others have been baptised in the careless perfunctory way once so common; there is then much reason to believe that some consecrators were not Bishops, for the simple reason that, *formally speaking, they were not Christians*. But at least there is a great presumption that where evidently our Lord has not left a rigid rule of baptism, He has not left a valid ordination.

“ ‘By the light of such presumptions as these, I interpret the doubtful issues of the antiquarian argument, and feel deeply that, if Anglican Orders are unsafe with reference to the actual evidence producible for their validity, much more unsafe are they when considered in their surroundings.

“ ‘Most sincerely yours,

“ ‘JOHN H. NEWMAN.’

“ ‘For our part, for the sake of truth and justice, we should be glad to see our Anglican friends give proofs, if they have them, of possessing Episcopacy, which would give their Bishops as good a claim as those of the Greek and Russian Church, to be invited as Bishops to the Œcumenical Council. Hitherto, however, we have seen no arguments which tended to show more than that Anglican Orders were not demonstratively invalid, such as those of the Presbyterians, Methodists, and other Dissenters would be. No arguments have as yet been brought forward, which have tended to remove the grave doubtfulness which hangs over Anglican Orders, in the estimation, no less of the Greeks and Russians, than of the Catholic Church.”

Such is DR. NEWMAN’S letter and the comments of the Editor of *Catholic Opinion*; and as to “Romish” opinion on the subject of Anglican Orders, another Romish paper, the *Weekly Register* (10th August, 1867), has spoken out most plainly:—

“ ‘Does not every educated Protestant know that we [Romanists] always have, and always shall, utterly ignore the Bishops and clergy of the Establishment as ministers of religion, and that in our eyes they are but so many highly respectable, well-paid laymen, entitled to our respect for their position in society; also, as a general rule, for their personal character, and because they are recognised civil servants of the Crown? But as Bishops or Priests we place them upon exactly the same footing as Mr. Spurgeon, of the Baptist, or Dr. Cumming, of the Presbyterian Church; that is, we deny *in toto* their orders, their mission, and all that constitutes a clergy of a regular Church.”

This clearly expressed opinion may be very galling to some of our "gaily attired youngsters," who desire to reintroduce mediæval "sacerdotalism," and seek to surround the office of "Priest" with a mysterious halo; but to the "educated *Protestant*" it is perfectly indifferent how a self-constituted priesthood estimates itself, or in what light priests view their fellow-Christians.

DR. NEWMAN, while professing to hold the same opinion, conveys it in a manner more characteristic of his temper and mind—amiable, but weak. Age has told upon the latter and subdued the ardour of the former: hence the feeble, enigmatical, and illogical effusion which I have ventured to make the subject of a few observations in the sequel.

I have carefully studied Dr. Newman's writings, particularly his later productions. They have, on my mind, the effect of having been written against his own convictions,—by one who is obliged to say something "for the sake of his position"—"acting as from a pressure from without." He invariably starts with a proposition, or theory, which he assumes in his own favour, but which he knows is questioned; he then argues on that assumption. He proceeds most illogically; and his conclusions, therefore, to a reflecting mind, are unsatisfactory. There is always a mystification of his exact meaning, which too often passes current, with the superficial, as learned:—*first*, because they knew that Dr. Newman had the reputation of being a scholar; and *secondly*, because his compositions are invariably elegant and classical. The rest they take for granted. When a member of the Church of England he wrote against the Church of Rome. On seceding to Rome he had no better explanation to give of his former conduct and opinions than that "he was only acting as from a pressure from without—it was necessary for his position," and with "a hope of approving himself to persons he respected, and a wish to repel the charge of Romanism."—A simple and honest avowal indeed! but that is exactly what he appears to me to be doing now when he writes against the Church of England.

C. H. COLLETTE.

23, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London.

## THE REPLY.

---

Disce docendus adhuc, quæ censet amiculis, et scis  
 Cæcus iter monstraſte velit: tamen aspice, ſi quid  
 Et nos, quod cures proprium feciſſe loquamur.

HORACE EPIST.

Yet hear what an unſkilful friend can ſay:  
 As if a blind man ſhould direct your way;  
 So I myſelf, though wanting to be taught,  
 May yet impart a hint that's worth your thought.

---

Dr. Newman, formerly of the “Anglican Church,” now a Romiſh Prieſt of the “Oratory,” Birmingham, in a frolicſome mood ſought to be ſevere on our young Ritualiſtic “Prieſts” who aſpire to the diſtinction of “Apoſtolic Succeſſioniſts,” delivered himſelf in his *Apologia* as follows:—“For myſelf I muſt have St. Philip’s gift, who ſaw the ſacerdotal character in the forehead of a gaily attired youngſter, before I can, by my own wit, acquieſce in it.” To this he added the following remark, “à propos to Anglican Orders”:—“For antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of viſible facts.” The precise meaning of this phrase ſeems to have puzzled many, among others a *Father Coleridge*; and we cannot be ſurpriſed at it. But allowances ſhould be made in examining this and ſimilar paſſages from the pen of Dr. Newman. We muſt take into conſideration his age, and the ſoftening effects on the brain produced by the Roman ſyſtem of training, at leaſt on thoſe who give themſelves up to it as Dr. Newman appears to have done. We have an illuſtration of this effect in the ſame paragraph in which the above extracts appear. The ſubject was *Apoſtolic Succeſſion*:—“As to its poſſeſſion of an Epiſcopal ſucceſſion (writes Dr. Newman) from the time of the Apoſtles, well, it (*i.e.*, the Church of England) may have it, and if the Holy See ever ſo decided, I will believe it, as

being the decision of a higher judgment than my own.”\* If the poor old “gentleman who” presides at the Vatican were to nod or wink, Dr. Newman would nod or wink according to order. The Pope decided that the Blessed Virgin Mary’s conception was immaculate, and although that was clearly an anti-Scriptural doctrine, and promulgated in the face of the tradition of his Church, Dr. Newman believes it on the same principle—that is, merely because he of the Vatican had so decided it. At the next Ecumenical Council we shall most probably have it decided that Popes are *personally* infallible, and Dr. Newman will *profess* to believe that also, or indeed any other absurdity that may emanate from that quarter. But perhaps Dr. Newman is indulging in another sly joke; “a higher judgment than his own” would never decide such an absurdity as the validity of Anglican Orders! Dr. Newman has addressed a letter to Father Coleridge with the avowed object of “trying to explain” the meaning of the enigmatic passage cited, and this letter has made the round of all the Romish periodicals. “The inquiry into Anglican Orders has ever been to him,” Dr. Newman informs Father Coleridge, “of a class which he must call dreary”:—

“For it is dreary to have to grope into the minute intricate passages and obscure corners of past occurrences, in order to ascertain whether this man was ever consecrated, *or that man used a valid form, or a certain sacramental intention came up to the mark*, or the report or register of an ecclesiastical act can be cleared of suspicion. On giving myself to consider the question, I never have been able to arrive at anything higher than a probable conclusion, which is most unsatisfactory except to antiquarians, who delight in researches into the past for their own sake.”

By this introductory remark, we are to presume that Dr. Newman does not give much faith to the “Nag’s-head” fable and the alleged consecration of “the first Protestant Bishop,” in some back room, or attic, of a city public-house. But, of course, he would even believe that piece of scandal if the

---

\* *Apologia*, Appendix, p. 26, first edition.

Pope took it into his head to endorse it! The words of Dr. Newman have their special significance nevertheless. He is too well versed in the history of his adopted Church to allow himself to state the result of his "researches" as to the *forms* used for alleged "valid ordination," and whether, as a fact, "sacramental *intention*" has "come up to the mark" or not; these subjects, when well sifted and exposed, will shake the very foundation on which Romish ordination is based. On this head, however, I propose to arrive at something more "satisfactory" than "probable conclusions," before I have finished with Dr. Newman's letter. Dr. Newman now proceeds to explain what he means by "visible facts":—

"I mean such definite facts as throw a broad antecedent light upon what may be presumed, in a case in which sufficient evidence is not forthcoming."

Poor Father Coleridge! If he is a simple-minded man, which he must be to ask Dr. Newman to explain anything relating to Roman theology clearly and satisfactorily, he will probably exclaim, "This may be a learned way of talking nonsense, but I don't understand it, and I want further explanation." Dr. Newman is obliging enough to give it (after his own fashion). "For instance" (he says),—

"The Apostolic Succession, its necessity, and its grace, is not an Anglican tradition, though it is a tradition found in the Anglican Church. By contrast our Lord's Divinity *is* an Anglican tradition—every one, high and low, holds it. It is not only in Prayer-book and Catechism, but in the mouths of all professors of Anglicanism. Not to believe it is to be no Anglican, and any persons in authority, for 300 years, who were suspected to doubt or explain it away, were marked men, as Dr. Colenso is now marked; and they have been so few that they could be counted. Not such is the Apostolical Succession; and, considering the Church is the *columna et firmamentum veritatis*, and is ever bound to stir up the gift that is in her, there is surely a strong presumption that the Anglican body has not what it does not profess to have. I wonder how many of its Bishops and Deans hold the doctrine at this time; some who do not, occur to the mind at once. One knows what was



the case thirty or forty years ago by the famous saying of Blomfield, Bishop of London."

Dr. Newman actually brings in contrast the *great fundamental truth of our religion*, "our Lord's Divinity," with the theological speculation of "Apostolic Succession," its alleged "necessity," and its alleged "grace"! He means, of course, a *personal* succession in Bishops and Priests conferred on them by their consecration or orders. The one, he is constrained to admit, is held by all classes in the Anglican Church (but only, be it observed, as an Anglican *tradition*), but the other is not even "an Anglican's tradition, but is a tradition found among us." A nice distinction; but we deprecate in the outset that the two doctrines should be brought into contrast. The divinity of our Lord is a revelation of Scripture (not an Anglican *tradition*), definite and precise, recorded by the Apostles, the confession, imposed as a duty, and special promises of salvation, are assured in the belief of that doctrine.\* It was on this *acknowledgment*, made by Peter, that our Lord built His Church, and *that truth* is the "pillar and foundation." The *Church* is a body of believers, and may bear witness of that saving truth, but it is neither the pillar nor foundation; but the believer's faith is built on that truth.† While, on the other hand, "Apostolic Succession" is not a Scriptural doctrine, it was never taught by the Apostles, but it is, from its very nature, an invention of man, though the existence of this supposed personal succession is made an Article of a standing or a falling Church! Its necessity is

---

\* Matt. x. 32; Mark viii. 38; Luke ix. 26; xii. 8; Rom. x. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 12; 1 John ii. 23; iv. 15; Matt. xvi. 18, &c. &c.

† If Dr. Newman refers to the text, 1 Tim. iii. 15, 16, he will find, by following the punctuation of Griesbach, that the "mystery of godliness" is the "pillar and ground of the truth;" "God manifest in the flesh" was the mystery of faith. Ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνα, ἵνα εἰδῆς, πῶς δὲ ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεισθαι, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζῶντος. Στύλος καὶ ἰδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ ὁμολογουμένως μέγα, ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον. But suppose "the Church of the living God" is referred to, Dr. Newman is none the nearer, for the Church consists of lay as well as clerical members, and the Roman Church is not exclusively the Church of God, though she may be one of the decaying branches of which St. Paul spoke (Rom. xii. 17—21).

alleged, with the gratuitous assertion added, that a grace accompanies all the administrative acts of the possessors.

Well, suppose the Anglican Church, or any other reformed Church, has not what the Roman priest chooses to call an Apostolic *personal* succession, what then? Are we, the lay members of such Churches, in danger of our salvation? Is that imperilled because a set of self-constituted priests tell us that they alone have a true Apostolic succession, an assertion, as we shall presently see, beyond the possibility of proof? Does Dr. Newman really believe that there is no possibility of attaining any means of grace except through a Roman priest? When, where, how, and to whom has this all-important fact been revealed? This, one would suppose, was a "fact" worthy of being made "visible," rather than the assertion that the Anglicans have not got it! If our salvation depended on any such *abstract principle*, such as a personal Apostolic succession, the Apostles surely would have warned us of the fact. But no! a self-constituted priesthood pleases to inform us, that they alone have this means of communicating grace committed to them, as they alone have a true succession. The grace of God is, they assert, communicated only through one sect of Christians, and that is their own.

St. Paul, in his epistle to the Christians at Rome, commended them for their *faith*, and not for any peculiar gift arising from a supposed Apostolic succession. He wrote this epistle A.D. 60, some twenty-seven or twenty-eight years after Christ is supposed to have conferred on St. Peter the Primacy, and the Roman Church appointed by our Lord as "the pillar and ground of truth," "*the Church of God.*" But in what light did St. Paul view that Church after twenty-seven years' growth? He specially called it "a wild olive tree, grafted in among other branches," and "with them partaking of the *root and fatness of the olive tree*;" and, as if in prophetic warning, he adds, "Boast not against the branches, but if thou boast, *thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.*" This should be conclusive that the Roman Church is not "*the pillar and foundation.*" St. Paul's instruction does not end here. He represents them arguing the possibility of their, in future

times, taking the place of the other branches of Christ's Church:—"Thou wilt say then, the branches were broken off that I might be grafted in." St. Paul meets this thus:—"Well; because of unbelief they were broken off: and thou *standest by faith*"—not, be it observed, by an assumed APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION, boasting of some such exclusive gift—"Be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches, *take heed lest he also spare not thee*. Behold, therefore, the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell, severity, but towards thee goodness, *if thou continue, in his goodness, otherwise thou shalt be cut off*."\* We have here something more than a "strong presumption" that the Church of Rome is not *the* root, the pillar and foundation of truth, and certainly an intimation that it was fallible; and its *boast* of Apostolic succession will be of little avail—it must live by *faith*.

But suppose it were true that they alone had a true personal succession, where is the evidence that the sacraments cannot be duly administered by any other minister of the Gospel? How does Dr. Newman make this alleged fact "visible"? Let me remind Dr. Newman of a "visible fact" which he well knows to be true—namely, that if Apostolic personal succession, its necessity or its grace, is not a *tradition* in the Anglican Church, a succession of the true *faith* is held by us, and he also knows that such is accounted a necessity with us, and that grace does flow as a consequence from such profession.

The mission of the Apostles was to preach the Gospel of Christ, a *tradition* while they lived, but which, as Ignatius of the first century said, "for the sake of greater security they deemed it necessary to attest by committing to writing;"† or, as Irenæus, a Christian Bishop of the second century, has it, "which (Gospel) the Apostles preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures *as the foundation and pillar of our faith*,"‡ baptising in the name of the

---

\* Romans xi. 17—22.

† *Apud. Eusebius, Eccl. Hist.*, Lib. iii. c. 36.

‡ *Iren. Adv. Hæres*, Lib. iii. c. 1, p. 117, Edit. Basil, 1526.

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; and these alone were considered to be the true successors of the Apostles who preached the same Gospel in its original simplicity, purity, and integrity, and led a life in conformity with the doctrines taught. This the early Christians maintained to be the *true* Apostolic succession, and we maintain that those alone are the true successors of the Apostles who follow in their footsteps. This is no new Protestant notion. The same Irenæus directed all "to obey those presbyters who have the Divine gift of the *faith*," and on the other hand to "forsake all wicked ministers, and to learn from such as have the *Divine gift of truth*."\* And so Tertullian, a Christian writer of the second century, clearly estimates the worthlessness of a claim to personal succession where the true *faith* is wanting:—"But if the heretics feign or fabricate such a succession, this will not help them, for their *doctrine itself*, compared with the doctrine of the Apostles, will, by its own diversity and contrariety, pronounce against them. To this form of trial will appeal be made by those Churches henceforward daily establishing, which, though they have neither any of the Apostles or Apostolic men for their founders, yet all agreeing in the same faith, are, from their consanguinity of doctrine, to be esteemed not the less apostolical than the former."† Gregory Nazianzen (A.D. 378) said, that "succession of piety ought to be esteemed the true succession, for he who maintains the *same doctrine of faith* is partner in the same chair, but he who defends a contrary doctrine ought, though in the chair of St. Mark, to be esteemed an adversary to it. This man, indeed, may have a *nominal succession*, but the other has the *very thing itself*, the *succession in deed and in truth*."‡ And as Ambrose, Bishop of Milan of the fourth century, very curtly summed up §:—"They have not the

---

\* *Iren. Adv. Hæres*, Lib. iv. c. 43—45.

† *Tert. de Præscrip. Hæres*, c. 32. Tom. ii., pp. 40, 41. *Halæ Magd.* 1770.

‡ In *Athanasii Oper.* Tom. ii., Appendix. Edit. Paris, 1627, and p. 390, Paris, 1778.

§ "Non habent Petri hæreditatem, qui Petri fidem non habent." *Amb. de Pæniti.*, c. 6, Tom. i., p. 156; Basil apud Joh. Frob. An. 152, and Tom. vi., col. 391, H., Paris, 1661.

succession of Peter that want the *faith* of Peter." \* Dr. Newman admits that all in the Anglican Church hold "the Lord's Divinity;" he knows that we subscribe to the Nicene (so called) Creed, and that that, too, is found in our "Prayer-book and Catechism." He knows, also, that the Trent Council itself declared that "all who profess the faith of Christ necessarily agree in that summary," which summary it also declared to be "that firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall never prevail," and this before that other Creed of Pope Pius IV. was invented. Such being acknowledged "visible facts," let Dr. Newman test the claim of our Anglican ministers to be accounted *true* successors of the Apostles, and he himself dare not deny the validity of their title. Standing by *faith*, why have not they got "the gift of grace"? Why, then, all this beating about and self-conceit? The Anglican Church does profess to teach the true faith, "to stir up the gift that is in her." What it professes to have—the Apostolic succession of faith—is the kernel. We are quite willing to let Dr. Newman and the priests of his profession, and the kindred spirits in our Church,†

---

\* We may note here the fact that Romanists have in some of their reprints of Ambrose's work tampered with this passage, in order to establish this figment of a personal succession. They have changed *fidem* to *sedem*, so that they would have Ambrose say, "They have not the *succession* of Peter who have not his *seat*." *Grat. de Pœnit.*, dist. 1, c. Potest fieri, c. lii., col. 1687, Tom. i., Lug. 1671. Ingenious, but not very honest! The Paris edition of Ambrose's Works, 1690, p. 399, Tom. ii., has *sedem* instead of *fidem*, with the following note:—"Omnes edit. ac Miss. nonnulli, qui *Petri fidem*: alii multo plures potiorisque qui *Petri sedem*."

† One of these kindred spirits in the Anglican Church is the *Rev. Thomas W. Mossman*, of West Torrington, Wragby, who undertook to remonstrate with Dr. Newman on the enormity of his charge against Anglican "Priests," declaring that "the whole question involved was one of life and death to poor Anglicans." He concludes his letter with these remarkable words:—

"I feel sure that you will not misunderstand my motive in thus writing to you. I think I know something of the troubles of this distracted English Church; and it is because I feel so strongly that these terrible distractions are to be healed, not by Anglican Priests coming to a belief that they are only laymen—even, it may be, unbaptised laymen—but by their believing in their priesthood, and acting upon it. And then, when they do this, I feel sure that, in God's own good time, it will come to pass that Anglicans will also see that it is God's will that they should submit to the Holy Apostolic See, and that it is their duty,

"the gaily attired youngsters," so happily designated by Dr. Newman, quarrel and scramble for the husks.

Dr. Newman, in continuation of his explanation "*A propos* of Anglican Orders—that Antiquarian arguments are altogether unequal to the urgency of visible facts," says, "If there is a true succession, there is a true Eucharist; if there is not a true Eucharist, there is no true succession."

Here is wisdom, indeed! A theological deduction inversed. We shall presently see that, measuring them by their own rule, there is no *true succession* of priests in the Roman Church; if there is no true succession, can there be a "true Eucharist," whatever that may mean? Our Blessed Lord instituted the Sacrament in both kinds; *bread* and *wine* were administered, and He enjoined the Apostles to do so in like manner in remembrance of Him, and to show forth His death until He came again; and we are told that Christ Himself was offered up once for all as a full and perfect sacrifice. The Roman priests do not give *bread* at all, but a wafer (a substance made of flour and honey, which, when analysed, is found to have none of the essentials of bread), and they entirely withhold the administration of the wine from the laity; and they call this a *sacrifice*, and pretend that Christ's very body, blood, bones and nerves, soul and divinity, which walked on earth and was crucified, and ascended into heaven, and at each elevation whole Christ, is offered up as an *unbloody* sacrifice, as a propitiation for sins for the living and the dead, and that it is the same sacrifice as the one sacrifice on the cross, though we are told that there remaineth no more sacrifice for sin (Heb. x. 26), that without shedding of blood there is no remission (Heb. x. 22), and that Christ should not

---

as well as their privilege, to be in communion with that Bishop who alone is the true successor of Peter, and, by Divine Providence, the Primate of the Catholic Church. The lurid, murky flame of Protestantism, enkindled in the sixteenth century, is rapidly becoming quenched, and the true light of the Gospel, which twice before came to England from Rome, is once more beginning to beam upon us from the Eternal City, where the Prince of the Apostles and the Doctor of the Gentiles shed their blood."—*The Month*, October, 1868, pp. 420, 421.

There is nothing to hinder the rev. gentleman at once availing himself of the privilege he appears to value so much. He will be more at home with Rome than with us.

offer Himself often, but once only (Heb. ix. 25, 26). Can such a process be the same sacrament as was instituted by our Lord at the Last Supper? or the same sacrifice on the cross which was a bloody sacrifice offered "once for all," full and perfect? If not, and it certainly is not, then is the Roman administration "not a true Eucharist;" and, therefore, according to Dr. Newman's logic, there can be no true succession in his fraternity. The entire paragraph is as follows:—

"If there is a true succession, there is a true Eucharist; if there is not a true Eucharist, there is no true succession. Now, what is the presumption here? I think it is Mr. Alexander Knox who says or suggests that, if so great a gift *be* given, it must have a *custos*. Who is the *custos* of the Anglican Eucharist? The Anglican clergy? Could I, without distressing or offending an Anglican, describe what sort of *custodes* they have been, and are, to their Eucharist? '*O bone custos*,' in the words of the poet, '*cui commendavi Filium Meum*!' Is it not charitable towards the bulk of the Anglican clergy to hope, to believe, that so great a treasure has not been given to their keeping? And would our Lord leave Himself for centuries in such hands? Inasmuch then as 'the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ' in the Anglican communion is without protective ritual and jealous guardianship, there seems to me a strong presumption that neither the real gift, nor its appointed guardians, are to be found in that communion."

"Who is the *custos* of the Anglican Eucharist!" What does Dr. Newman mean? *We* do not make a wafer God, and lock it up in a box as the Roman priests do, and therefore we do not want *custodes* or keepers. But we are without a "protective ritual"! We are not aware that either our Lord instituted, or the Apostles practised or professed, "a protective ritual," save as described in the New Testament; and we think that our Anglican ritual, so far as the actual administration of the elements is concerned, is as instituted by our Lord.\* But mark his modesty and his charity! Dr.

---

\* With reference to "a protective ritual," I was much struck with the following paragraph, which I extract from the narrative of *Father Felix* (the Rev. J. J. Varnier) late Roman Catholic chaplain at Allahabad, now a missionary at Patna

Newman cannot for the world describe, "without distressing or offending an Anglican," what sort of *custodes* they have been! His charity consists "in the hope to believe that so great a treasure has *not* been given to their keeping!" One would suppose that his charity would have led him to hope that the Anglican should be a fit administrator of our Lord's appointment, inasmuch as, without leave of the Roman Catholic Church, they follow the command of our Lord in doing what He instituted "in remembrance of Him." Oh, no! he is afraid of "distressing or offending an Anglican;" but nevertheless he has no hesitation in declaring that there is "a strong presumption that neither the real gift, nor its appointed guardians, are to be found in their communion." He means

---

under the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," entitled, "Why I left the Communion of the Church of Rome," republished by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (a book well worthy of perusal). It is as follows (pp. 14, 15):—

"I admired the Communion Service very much. As a Liturgy, it was wanting in nothing; and I found it so like the Liturgy of the Roman Church itself that I had no doubt it was one of its Liturgies at some former period. I found that up to the Preface it exactly follows the Roman Missal, with the exception of the *Gloria*, which in the Prayer-book is at the end. Then the prayers preceding the consecration of the bread and wine are most heart-stirring. They impress the mind of the communicant with awe and fear at approaching the table of the Lord, and at the same time with a consoling sense of the greatness and tenderness of the love of Christ, in giving us the pledge of union with Himself. The act of consecration itself is in the very same words as those employed by the Roman Church, our Lord's own words of institution. What a pity, thought I, that the Church of England does not believe in Transubstantiation; for if she did this, there would be indeed as complete a celebration of the Sacrament as in the Roman Church itself, and its members would partake of all the blessings of the loving Redeemer, whom they would really and truly receive in their own hearts. I felt convinced that after all the service of the Church of England could not be so formal and dry as represented by Roman Catholics, for no heart can help feeling the sublimity of the sentiment which the words of the service itself convey; though, of course, there being an absence of exterior apparatus, of candles, lights, pictures, and other ornaments, and of imposing and grand dresses of the priest, when celebrating, there is nothing to strike the senses or excite the fancy of the congregation."

The Canon of the Mass was compiled some time in the sixth century, and although there have been many changes made since, nevertheless it bears internal evidence in many places that the compilers had no notion of Transubstantiation, as the language is inconsistent with the doctrine. (See Foye's *Romish Rites, Offices, and Legends*, p. 187. London, 1850.)



by this, there is no true ministry in the Anglican Church; and where there is no true ministry there can be no true sacraments; and where there is no true sacrament there is no possibility of salvation; and this is Dr. Newman's charity! What "stronger presumption" has he that all these peculiar privileges are secured to the Roman priesthood? *Strong presumption*, indeed! and so we poor Anglicans are to be cast out of the pale of salvation, having no possible means of grace on Dr. Newman's "strong presumptions"! It is as well that we are not left to the mercy of his "charity."

And this is the second stage of illustration of Dr. Newman's "visible facts."

Before proceeding to the third head, let me cite one more example of Dr. Newman's extreme delicacy and charity towards us Anglicans!

Dr. Newman was asked how there could be a "true Eucharist" in the Roman Church, while for three centuries it was Arian.\* A very pertinent question, inasmuch as the Arians had no orthodox belief in Christ, and that which they brought down upon the "altar" could not, therefore, have been true Christ (except, indeed, Transubstantiation was not then invented)—at least, the Arian Bishops and Priests of Rome could not have had the same *intention* as the post-Tridentine priesthood have. Dr. Newman's answer is characteristic:—"The Arians certainly had continuity and establishment; they lasted three centuries, and it was a union of Church and State. But was there any sacrilege in their Eucharist, such as that of which I have spoken as prevailing in the Anglican Church on the supposition of the validity of their orders? I think not?"† Can Dr. Newman's mind be in a sane state! Have not Anglicans got a continuity of three centuries, and a union of Church and State? are these "the suppositions on which he bases the validity of orders"? and has the orthodox *faith* no part in the test or title? It is my firm belief, and the most charitable conclusion to which I can come, is that Dr. Newman has gone crazy on this subject. He prefers a state

---

\* See *The Month*, October, 1868, p. 420.

† p. 427.

of heretical Arianism to the admittedly orthodox teaching in the Anglican Church, because there is a "strong presumption" that her "orders" are not valid! There is sacrilege in the Anglican Eucharist; there is none in the Arian! and yet he pretends that he "could not, without distressing or offending an Anglican, describe what sort of *custodes* they have been and are of *their* Eucharist," and in the plenitude of his charity he exclaims, "Believe me, I love Anglicans too well, and know too intimately the depth and sincerity of their zeal, to have any pleasure in thus speaking of them." And this he says only a few lines above the quoted passage where he declares his preference to an Arian than to an Anglican *sacrilegious* "Eucharist"!—that is to say, he would prefer to partake of the Lord's Supper administered by an Arian priest than by a clergyman of the Church of England! and this is his love for Anglicans, whose "depth and sincerity of zeal" he "so intimately knows." This is the way he attempts to throw dust into the eyes of his readers, who exclaim, Oh! how gentle, how amiable he is!

Οὗτος ἐστὶ γαλιλάτης γέρον.—MENANDER.

The whole paragraph in which the repudiation of Anglican Orders occurs, he says, "he wrote with much reluctance and pain, and as a matter of sheer duty. In the volume in question he was bringing out his whole mind on the general subject of which it treated;" and he adds, "Ever since that time I have been treated with remarkable gentleness and sympathy by Anglican publications, and I have been grateful to them." Indeed! and in recompense for Anglican forbearance, Dr. Newman forthwith classes their ministry below the Socinian,—or Arian, which is much the same thing! Mawkish and feeble sentimentalism is Dr. Newman's failing. He has the knack of saying very disagreeable things couched under soft words.

Under the third head, Dr. Newman starts by asserting that "previous baptism is the condition of the valid administration of the other sacraments." This, indeed, is a self-imposed condition on the *Roman* priesthood. But there is yet another to which I desire to draw particular attention, and that is, the *intention* of the officiating priest. The great Cardinal and

Archbishop Bellarmine, and prince of Roman controversial writers, felt the force of this condition acutely; for on an examination of this doctrine of intention in the officiating minister, he said, "None can be certain, by the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, since a sacrament cannot be celebrated without the minister's intention; and no one can see the intention of another."\* Baptism in the Roman Church is accounted valid though administered by lay hands, or even by a heretic, if done in the name of the Holy Trinity. But the other sacraments of the Roman Church cannot be administered except by duly ordained Bishops and Priests. "Orders" depend on the validity of the *intention* of the Bishop, as well as the validity of his own ordination and institution. The same Cardinal puts the question in its proper light when he says, "If we consider in Bishops their power of ordination and jurisdiction, we have no more than a *moral certainty* that they are true Bishops."† Dr. Newman is fond of dealing in "strong presumptions;" perhaps he will make this *moral certainty* in ordination a *visible fact*. But the whole question of "moral certainty" and "visible fact" was largely and forcibly dwelt upon by the Bishop of Minori, Ambrogio Caterino, at the Council of Trent, when this doctrine of previous *intention* in the officiating priest being necessary to the validity of a sacrament was discussed; and before I transcribe his words it must be stated that the Council decreed, notwithstanding, that every one who should hold a contrary opinion to this was to be damned to all eternity; and they as emphatically damned all who pretended that a bad priest, a priest in actual mortal sin, did not, on that account, administer a true sacrament. Mark the contradiction. How can a bad priest, a priest in mortal sin, have the true intention? Conceive a priest, red-handed with the blood of a fellow-creature, or that priest at Turin, who made use of the "confessional" to debauch all the young women who came to him

---

\* Bellarm. *Disput.* "de *Justificatione*," Lib. 3, c. 8, sec. 5, tom. iv., col. 488. Edit. Prag., 1721.

† Bellar. *de Milit. Eccles.*, Lib. 3, cap. x., *ad secundum*. sec. 37, tom. ii., p. 82. Prag., 1721.

to receive the "sacrament of penance;" the number of cases proved against him formed a frightful list! Conceive such priests, if you possibly can, administering Baptism or the Lord's supper with a *right intention*! But, setting aside such extreme cases, Luther has recorded, as a fact, that such was the incredulity among priests in his day, as to the supposed change of the elements, that, instead of using the words of consecration, it was very common for the celebrating priest to say, "Bread thou art, and bread thou shalt remain." Again, take the fact related by D'Alembert in his *Account of the Destruction of the Jesuits in France*.\* D'Alembert himself was an unbeliever, but he mentions a Jesuit missionary whom he knew to be also an unbeliever, in fact, an infidel in his opinions—nay worse, scarcely believing in a God, but who had faced death twenty times for the sake of the religion he professed, and which he preached with such success to the savages. It was represented to this Jesuit that his conduct was inconsistent. "Ah," replied the Jesuit missionary, "you have no idea of the pleasure that is felt in commanding the attention of twenty thousand people, in persuading them what we believe not ourselves." How often did this priest baptise and administer the other sacraments? Could he possibly have had a *right intention* to do what the Church requires, if he did not believe either in its Divine institution or its efficacy? We now can appreciate the warning and the solemn protest of the Bishop of Minori, delivered at the Council of Trent, previous to the passing of the decree:—

"But suppose the necessity of mental intention. If a priest charged with the cure of four or five thousand souls was an unbeliever, a hypocrite, who, whether in the baptism of children or in the absolution of penitents, or in the consecration of the Eucharist, had no intention of doing what the Church does, we must say that all the children were damned, the penitents not absolved, and all those who have received the Communion have received no advantage from it. . . .

"If any said these cases were rare, would to God that in this corrupt age there were no cause to think that they are

---

\* London, 1766, p. 67, translation.

very frequent. But even admitting them to be very rare, or even unique; yet suppose, for example, a bad priest, who is a hypocrite, and who has no intention of administering true baptism to a child, and *that afterwards this child should become a Bishop of a great city*, and during a long succession of years he has ordained a great number of priests, we must admit that this child, not being baptised, will not have received ordination, and, consequently, all those whom he may have ordained will have received nothing; and that thus there will be in this great city neither sacrament, nor penance, nor Eucharist, since these cannot exist without ordination, nor ordination without a true Bishop, nor any Bishop, if he has not been previously baptised; and thus, by the malice of a single minister, a million sacraments will be rendered nugatory.”\*

Now let me transcribe the entire third instance, in illustration of Dr. Newman’s “visible facts”:—

“Previous baptism is the condition of the valid administration of the other sacraments. When I was in the Anglican Church I saw enough of the lax administration of Baptism, even among High Churchmen, though they did not of course intend it, to fill me with great uneasiness. Of course there are definite persons whom one might point out, whose baptisms are sure to be valid. But my argument has nothing to do with *present* baptisms. Bishops were baptised, not lately, but as children. The present Bishops were consecrated by other Bishops, they again by other. What I have seen in the Anglican Church makes it very difficult for me to deny that every now and then a Bishop was a consecrator who had never been baptised. Some Bishops have been brought up in the North as Presbyterians, others as Dissenters, others as Low Churchmen, others have been baptised in the careless, perfunctory way once so common: there is, then, much reason to believe that some consecrators were not Bishops, for the simple reason that, formally speaking, they were not Christians.†

---

\* *Histoire de Concil de Trente, écrite en Italien (par Paul Sarpi) traduit par Courayer.* Tom. i., Lib. ii., pp. 432, 433. Amst., 1751.

† Dr. Newman is not consistent. It had been objected that Roman Bishops and Priests for three centuries had been Arian, and other Roman

But at least there is a great presumption that where evidently our Lord has not left a rigid rule of baptism, He has not left a valid ordination."

Compare Dr. Newman's experiences with those of the Bishop of Minori. "Would to God," he says, "there was no cause to think that the cases he contemplates were *very frequent*." All Dr. Newman's experience was, "the administration of Baptism was lax" among certain Anglicans. Caterino's and Bellarmine's difficulty with Romish Bishops and priests is much greater than that raised by Dr. Newman as regards Anglican ministers and Bishops; but he dare not charge against the *present race* either *infidelity* or *hypocrisy*. But there is "much reason to believe (says Dr. Newman) that some consecrators were not Bishops, for the simple reason that *formally speaking they were not Christians*." Does he go back to Popish times? or perhaps, shielding himself under this assumed "charity" and extreme delicacy in desiring not to "offend," he would rather not state which of our Bishops were not Christians! Anglican Bishops not Christians! Dr. Newman has been already convicted by a jury of twelve Englishmen as a libeller, when he sought to rob the character and good fame of a faithful minister of the Gospel, whose only crime was to have abjured the errors and superstitions of Popery, and Dr. Newman paid the penalty of his want of "charity" by a heavy fine. We call for proofs of his alleged "visible facts," that any Anglican Bishop was not, "formally speaking, a Christian," and if he declines this chal-

---

Priests were infidel; and it became very difficult, therefore, to conceive how the consequences contemplated by Dr. Newman, as existing in the Anglican Church, existed, in fact, to a much worse degree in the Romish Church. And "would our Lord leave Himself for centuries in the hands of such"? His reply is most contradictory. "It does not suffice, for instance, to diminish the cogency of my argument against Anglican Orders, drawn from the circumstances of the Anglican Eucharist, by referring to the circumstances of the Arian Eucharist in the fourth, fifth, and sixth centuries, or to the knots of infidel priests, here and there, now and then, in the last 400 years; for suppose you are able to do so, still, if you do not demolish it utterly, something of force in the argument is left, such as to preserve for it its place in a whole bundle of sticks, each of which (I might for argument's sake allow) you could snap in two, if taken separately from the rest."—*The Month*, October, p. 424, 1868.

lenge, let him remain still under the brand of a *libeller and slanderer*.

But Dr. Newman thinks he has discovered some laxity in the administration of Baptism, even among our High Churchmen, which "filled him with the greatest uneasiness." Well! does a poor helpless infant therefore suffer, even if this were true? But Dr. Newman dare not assert that the *form* prescribed by our Lord (Matt. xxviii. 19), in the name of the Holy Trinity, has not been in all cases followed by us. But what would he say if a Bishop of a particular diocese allowed Baptism to be administered in the name of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity only? What would be the effect on his sensitive theological nerves? It would be rank heresy, of course, and not one of the so baptised would, "formally speaking, be Christians"! Now, let me remind Dr. Newman that Pope Nicholas I. in his first decree on Baptism allowed baptism to be made in the name of Christ only, without the express mention of the Trinity, and to be valid, which is contrary to Scripture,\* and is therefore a rank heresy. He may answer with Bellarmine, who always had, in similar cases, a ready excuse at hand, *Eum non definendo sic dixisse, sed ut particularem doctorem*, that he spoke this not definitely, but as a particular doctor! But is that a valid excuse according to Romish theories? How many invalid baptisms were thus effected? and did not the frightful consequences pointed out by the Bishop of Minori follow? Can Dr. Newman make it a "visible fact" that none of those so baptised were afterwards ordained priests, and exercised their calling as such? Such an idea ought to strike terror into his soul! But Bellarmine's excuse is a weak defence, for this doctrine was promulgated by a Pope on exactly the same authority as was the doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception," which Dr. Newman receives on no other authority. It was a decree of a reigning Pope! How else does a Pope make known his decisions but by a decree? It becomes, when entered in the Canon Law, a part of "the constitutions" of his Church; which, by his creed, thus actually became an *article of faith*—"I admit and embrace all other

---

\* Matt. xxviii. 19, Matt. iii. 11, John i. 33.

*constitutions* and observances of the same Church." This decree of Nicholas was published to the whole world and is placed among the Roman Canons.\* "The Holy See has so decided," and Dr. Newman "must believe" in this heretical process of baptism" as being the decision of a higher judgment than his own." Dr. Newman is also governed by the Roman Canon Law; he cannot escape from its consequences. Out of his own mouth is Dr. Newman convicted; but his *credulity* will not alter "visible facts." I have now only to add the concluding passage of Dr. Newman's letter to Father Coleridge:—"By the light of such presumptions as these, I interpret the doubtful issues of the antiquarian argument, and feel deeply that, if Anglican orders are unsafe with reference to the *actual evidence producible* for their validity, much more unsafe are they when considered in their surroundings." "The actual evidence producible!" I have given the letter in its entirety, and we ask, where is the *evidence* to illustrate the alleged "visible facts"? Dr. Newman may be considered a very clever man, but he has a very strange and inconclusive way of making even that alleged "fact" visible.

If any one were to bring to bear on secular subjects the same empty platitudes, inconclusive, illogical, and unproved assertions, as Dr. Newman does on the present occasion, and which are, in fact, the characteristic of all Dr. Newman's works since he left the Anglican Church, it would create contempt for the writer, in law or politics he would be scouted; but in theology, such an one is only tolerated from a charitable concession, that the writer is, at least, impressed with the truth of his convictions, though arrived at by a process wholly unexplained. Dr. Newman's later writings make no other impression on the educated and logical mind than that of a feeling of pity—pity in witnessing the wreck of a once gifted intellect! With Romanists a vague feeling of mistrust is excited lest the Doctor's early impressions should crop up again, to the scandal of his newly adopted community.† Hence perhaps is the

---

\* *Grat. Decr. Corp. Juris. Canon*, tom. i. p. 2160. Paris, 1612.

† In 1838 Dr. Newman published a second edition of his *Prophetical Office of the Church viewed relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, which he



reason of the non-promotion of Dr. Newman to ecclesiastical rank. He has formed a school of his own, which is not all that Romanists would desire (his system of development of doctrine is the severest blow one could aim at their claim to antiquity and apostolicity); while, on the other hand, he is deemed a too valuable acquisition to be dispensed with.

I will now proceed to examine the "issue of the antiquarian argument," which Dr. Newman had weighty reason for avoiding, and we shall see on what "strong presumptions" the Roman priesthood have to rely for the validity of their claim to priestly orders, when considered on the footing of their own rules and requirements, "and their surroundings."

I have given the entire of Dr. Newman's letter to Father Coleridge. If it conveys any meaning to the reader, the whole might be summed up in a few words: there being no Apostolic Succession in the Anglican Church, there can be no Episcopacy, no Orders, no Sacraments, no graces or gifts to be conferred by her ministry, and, therefore, there can be no salvation in that communion. If he does not mean all this, I see no practical advantage to be derived from the theory, except, perhaps, the very questionable privilege held out by the editor of *Catholic Opinion*\* to the Bishops of the Greek and Russian Churches (who, it is alleged, "possess an Episcopacy," which we do not), of attending, but not voting at, the proposed General Council! The same editor asserts in his observations on Dr. Newman's letter, that "No arguments have as yet been brought forward which have tended to remove the grave doubtfulness which hangs over Anglican

---

wrote while a professed member of the Anglican Church. In p. 103 he speaks of the Roman Church as "crafty, obstinate, wilful, malicious, cruel, unnatural, as madmen are; or rather, she may be said to resemble a demoniac. She is her real self only in name; and till God vouchsafe to restore her we must treat her as if she were the Evil One who governs her." Has the Roman Church changed since 1838? And now the very obvious question, suggested by Dr. Newman, presents itself:—

"Would our Lord leave Himself for centuries in such hands?"

Dr. Newman has been absorbed into the system, and it is only a fair presumption that he himself is now governed by "the Evil One," and may it please God to restore him to the light of truth in His own good time!

\* September 5, 1868, p. 395.

Orders in the estimation of the Catholic Church." It is not my present object to attempt to remove this doubt, for we really set so little value on the "fact," even if proved, *at least in the Romish view of the question*; but inasmuch as the Roman Church having made the validity of her "orders" absolutely essential to the proper administration of her sacraments, without which they pretend there is no salvation, I intend to show not only is there no certainty in her "orders," but, measured by her own rule, there are very "strong presumptions" that they are positively invalid. Before Dr. Newman fell to work in picking holes in his neighbour's coat, he should have patched up his own rags.

We know that "orders" was by the Council of Florence in 1439 first authoritatively declared to be one of Rome's seven sacraments; indeed, it was at that Council that this number was decided upon, though the idea was started in the twelfth century; but the Council of Trent, in 1547, made it a matter of *faith* that there are no more and no less than seven sacraments; and I may mention here the further fact that, with regard to this particular number of "seven," an eminent divine of the Roman Church, Cassander, after considerable research, came to the conclusion that, previous to the time of Peter Lombard (the probable inventor of the theory), A.D. 1140, the number of the sacraments as being *seven* was not determined in the Church.\* It remained a private opinion, until imposed as an article of faith by the Council of Florence 1439. Rome has declared "orders" to be one of these seven sacraments. Considering the consequences attending its administration, and that through it alone Apostolic Succession is supposed to be transmitted, it is deemed the most important of all the Roman sacraments. "From an attentive consideration (says their Catechism) of the nature of the other sacraments, we shall find little difficulty in perceiving that, so dependent are they all on that of orders, that, without its intervention, some could not exist, or be administered, whilst others would be stripped of the religious rites and solemn ceremonies, and of that exterior respect which should

---

\* *Cassander de Numer. Sacrament.* Art. xiii. p. 951. Paris, 1616.

accompany their administration.”\* And the same Catechism proceeds to state, that we must be “first made acquainted with the dignity and excellence of the sacrament, if we regard its highest degree, which is the priesthood.” The dignity of the priesthood is not to be overlooked. They have recorded the estimation in which they held themselves, in rather startling language. Here it is from the same Catechism:—

“Since the Bishops and priests are, as it were, God’s interpreters and messengers, who, in His name, teach men the Divine law and the precepts of life, *and represent the person of God on earth*, it is evident that no greater office than theirs can be imagined. *Therefore, they are justly called not only angels, but gods, because they possess amongst us the strength and power of the immortal God.*”†

This power is stated to be of as well *making (conficiendi)* and offering the body and blood of our Lord *as of remitting sins*. And this power is pretended to be conferred on even bad, immoral, debauched priests; the character being, as alleged, indelible. There is not, I venture to assert, one right-minded lay Roman Catholic who believes a word of this. But does Dr. Newman believe it? Of course he does (profess) to believe that he himself is not only an angel but a god! “If the Holy See have ever so decided, I will believe it, as being the decision of a higher judgment than my own.” This, it will be remembered, he said of Apostolic Succession, as being in the Anglican Church. This Catechism has been formally and solemnly approved by Popes up to this day, and he therefore, on his own principle, has no option in the matter; he must believe himself to be not only an angel but a god! I do not desire to be personal, but a very curious-looking photograph is to be seen in our shop windows, of an ascetic and cadaverous-looking elderly gentleman with a polka jacket on, and a cap much like a carpenter’s paper working cap; that old gentleman is, in his own opinion, not only an angel but a god, because he pretends he can convert flour and water and

---

\* *Catech. of the Council of Trent*, Donovan’s Translation, pp. 304-5. Dublin, 1829.

† *Ibid.* p. 305.

honey into a god, "body, blood, *bones and nerves*, soul and divinity,"\* and, as God, judicially (not ministerially), "having the strength and power of the immortal God," to remit your sins, on certain prescribed conditions invented by his sect! That photograph represents Dr. Newman! Dr. Newman's mind and disposition are so happily constituted, that he is quite prepared to receive this act of canonisation of himself, or any bit of absurdity (not to employ a harsher term) which may emanate from the great magician who presides over the City of the Seven Hills.

We here, however, perceive the importance priests themselves attach to their own dignity, derived from their ordination. One would, from this, expect to find some degree of certainty in the administration of their so-called sacrament, which confers this dignity, but I venture to assert that the difficulties and uncertainties attending their "orders," all self-imposed, are of such a nature as to render it wholly impossible for any single priest to say that he has been properly ordained,—that he is a priest,—and therefore his claim to a personal Apostolic Succession is a mere empty boast.

" — Miserum est aliorum incumbere famæ,  
Ne collapsa ruant subductis tecta columnis."—*Juvenal, Sat. viii. 76.*

'Tis poor relying on another's fame,  
For, take the pillars but away, and all  
The superstructure must in ruin fall.

According to Dr. Newman's own theory, even an irregularity in the baptism of a Bishop would invalidate the orders conferred by him. Now, each priest ought to have a certainty

\* "Jam vero hoc loco a pastoribus explecandum est, non solum verum Christi corpus et quidquid ad veram corpus rationem pertinet, velut *ossa et nervos*, sed etiam totum Christum in hoc sacramento conteneri."—*Catech. Concil. Trid., Pt. ii., No. xxxi., p. 241. Venice 1582, and Paris 1848, p. 235.*

"Continetur totum corpus Christi, *ossa nervi et alia*."—*Thos. Aquinas iii. 2, 76, c. 1. Summa. Lyons, 1567.*

"Comprehendens carnem, ossa nervos," &c., *Dens Theologia*, v. p. 276. Dublin, 1832.

The Maynooth translator of the Trent Catechism, Dublin, 1829, appeared ashamed of this carnality, so he quietly dropped the words "*bones and nerves*" from his translation! Nevertheless Dr. Newman is ordained to create "*bones and nerves, soul and divinity*," at his free will.

that each successive ordination from the time of the Apostles to himself has been in all respects regular, and in conformity with his Church's self-imposed terms and requirements; and how can he have this certainty if it be the fact, as we have seen by the acknowledgment of Cardinal Bellarmine, "that we have no more than a moral certainty that Bishops are true Bishops and have the power to ordain;" and that "no one can be certain with the certainty of faith that he receives a true sacrament, since a sacrament cannot be celebrated without the minister's intention, and that no one can see the intention of another"? I have already recorded the practical difficulties suggested by the Romish Bishop of Minori on this subject. It may be very pleasant amusement for Dr. Newman to throw stones at his neighbour's greenhouses, but he lives in a glass house himself; and if he fancies that he will escape the dangers of his own position by assaulting his neighbour he is mistaken, for we are stating difficulties his own Church has raised. She, in fact, furnishes us with the material to return the assault with effect.

But I take higher ground than this. The validity of Roman Orders depends on the fact, that "orders" is a properly constituted sacrament instituted by our Lord, and has been so considered by the Church from the time of the Apostles. The texts they commonly quote are 2 Tim. i. 6; Luke xxii. 19; John xx. 22, 23. I deny that "orders" ever was considered a sacrament, properly so called, even by the Roman Church, during the first six centuries of the Christian era, or that *intention* was considered necessary to give validity to a sacrament for fifteen centuries. Dominicus Soto, a very learned Romanist, asserted, according to Bellarmine, that "Episcopal ordination is not truly and properly a sacrament."\* Those who held the same opinion could not have had a true *intention* in administering or receiving "orders."

Another essential in the sacrament is that it should have been instituted by Christ. Of course this is asserted in the case of "orders," but that has not yet been proved, for, as we

---

\* *Bellarmin. Disput.*, Tom. iii., p. 718. Prag. 1721.

shall presently see, they are not agreed whether the imposition of hands confers the grace, or the delivery of the cup and paten, both forms being adopted and rejected in turn, though the *form* of ordination is made an essential!

The Trent Catechism lays down the following as a rule:—  
 “Every sacrament consists of two things—*matter*, which is called the element; and *form*, which is commonly called the word. . . . In the sacraments of the new law the *form* is so definite that any, even a casual, deviation from it renders the sacrament null. These, then, are the parts which belong to the nature and substance of the sacrament, and of which every sacrament is necessarily composed.”\* Now, this must, if true, have been the rule from the institution of “orders” by Christ, without any deviation. Can any one state what *matter* our Lord instituted, and what *form* He used, and when He instituted “orders” a sacrament? The laying on of hands by the Bishop, accompanied by prayer, was an ancient form of ordination of ministers. But this form has been superseded and declared immaterial. The Council of Florence, in 1439 (which declared “orders” to be a sacrament), instituted for the *first* time that the *matter* of the sacrament should be the delivery of the chalice with wine and water, and a paten with a host lying on it, and that the *form*, or ordination act, should in future be “Receive thou the power to offer sacrifices to God, and to celebrate masses, both for the living and the dead, in the name of the Lord.”† The Council of Trent laid down no *form*, nor did it declare the *matter* of this so-called sacrament, for the simple reason that both had been changed by the Council of Florence, and the less said on that subject the better. The use of the above form cannot be traced to an earlier period than the tenth century. We may in vain searched for this form in any author, in any ritual or ordinal, and in any Christian Church, for nearly one thousand years after Christ. The ordination *without the imposition of hands* (*sine impositione manuum*) was declared valid by the

\* *Donovan's Translation*, pp. 145, 146. Dublin, 1829.

† *Decret. Unionis. Concil. Florent. Lab. et Coss. Concil.* Tom. xviii. col. 550. Venet., 1728.

Roman Canon Law.\* And the *Maynooth Text-book* also declares that ceremony (*i.e.*, laying on of hands) unessential.† If we turn to the present service of consecrating a Presbyter in the *Pontificale Romanum*, we find that it expressly forbids that prayers should accompany the ceremony. The laying on of hands is a part of the after service, but, as we have seen, non-essential. The words of Dens are—"This last (the imposition of hands) is not essential; 1st. Because it has never been used in the Greek Church. 2nd. Because neither has it always been in use in the Latin Church. For neither in rituals nor in Councils, nor in the writings of those who have discoursed upon divine offices and ordinations, is any trace (*vestigium*) of it to be found." And, what is also remarkable, we are told in this same *Text-book*, with reference to the *form* and *matter* established by the Council of Florence, and now rendered absolutely essential, that "neither Scripture nor tradition make any mention of these ceremonies (*i.e.*, the delivery of the cup and paten), nor is the use of them found at this day among the Greeks, nor was it even among the Latins for the first ten ages of the Church."‡ And again, we have the testimony of Morinus, a most eminent divine of the Roman Church and scholar, one who had an extensive knowledge of the Fathers and Councils, and entitled to rank among the most learned men of his age. He entered the "*Oratory*" in 1618, and died 1659. He wrote a learned work on "Orders," wherein he clearly proved that the imposition of hands of the Bishop, with the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," is not essential to ordination, but is only a benediction superadded to it, and he showed that it was not used in the primitive Church, nor mentioned by any ancient writer.§ I refer to this form because it is so often asserted by Romanists that the Scriptural authority (2 Tim. i. 6) of the institution of the so-called "Sacrament of Orders" is proved

---

\* *Corpus. Juris. Can.*, Tom. ii. p. 265. Paris, 1612.

† *Dens Theologia Moralis ad usum Seminorum*, Tom. iv., de *Ordine*. p. 46. Dublin, 1832.

‡ *Dens*, as above, p. 57.

§ *Comment. de Sacrament. Eccles. Ord. Secundum Antiquos et recentione*, &c. Fol. Ant. 1695, par. 3, p. 106.

by the direction of laying on of hands and the descent of the Holy Spirit; and even our High Church divines lay much account to this *form* and invocation of the Holy Ghost. The same Morinus said he could find no manuscript more than 400 years old (now 600) which mentioned the imposition of hands with the words "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," as now appointed in the *Pontificale* as part of the after ceremony. And the same learned writer, with reference to the present *form* and *matter*, the delivery of the vessels and the words "Receive ye the power to offer," &c., adduces unanswerable arguments to prove that these also are non-essentials in orders, since neither the primitive Church nor the Eastern Church, nor the Roman Rituals, nor the writers in the Roman Offices ever mention them till within [then] 700 years; and he adds that at first these were only adopted in consecration of Bishops, and afterwards, by custom only, they were used in the ordination of Priests, there being, as he testifies, no decree of Councils or Popes found to support them until the Council of Florence, in 1439.\* I merely draw attention to these facts as conveying to my mind undoubted proofs that "orders" having for fifteen centuries no recognised *form* or *matter*, could not have been a sacrament even in the Roman Church.

We have seen the precise and absolute requirement in the administration of the sacraments as to *form* and *matter* laid down by the Trent Catechism, so that even a casual deviation from these would render the sacrament void. To the same effect are we instructed in the *Maynooth Text-book*. It says—"To a true sacrament of the new law three things are required and are sufficient; first, that there be a sensible rite; second, that this rite have the power of producing grace; *third, that the same rite has been permanently instituted and commanded by Christ.*"† So that to the efficient ordination of a priest, the rite—*form* and *matter*—must have been permanently instituted and commanded by Christ as such, and not altered in the minutest particular. Apply these requisi-

\* *Comment. de Sacrament. Eccles. Ord. Secundum Antiquos et recentione*, &c., p. 102.

† *Dens Theologia*, &c., Tom. iv., de Ordine, p. 7. Dublin, 1832.



tions, absolutely demanded by the Roman Church, with the admissions made by Romanists themselves, and we ask in all seriousness, what becomes of her so-called Sacrament of Orders? Can Dr. Newman assert that any one priest of his Church is truly ordained? Can he possibly believe himself to be truly ordained a priest? And if not, what becomes of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession? What becomes of all the other sacraments of his Church, which, for their due performance, require a *duly* ordained priest? The Church of Rome has created its own embarrassments, and Dr. Newman must first extricate himself from his own difficulties before he finds fault with Anglican Orders.

In conclusion, let me draw the attention of my readers to a very important question (important, at least, to Romanists)—the “Divine Right of Bishops.” Holding the extreme opinions they do, one would suppose their Bishops would claim a “Divine right” in their office and administrations, taking into consideration that, by their act, in ordination, they are conferring (as they allege) Divine powers, and, in fact, constituting an order “not only of angels but gods”! The subject whether Bishops held their office by Divine right was debated at the Trent Council with the greatest violence and asperity on both sides, as recorded by their historians, Sarpi, Le Plat, and Pallavicini. The diversity of opinion that prevailed, we are told, occasioned the most rancorous discord. The Pope opposed the notion of a Divine right in Bishops. Those who held the doctrine treated their opponents as slaves, who had ignobly sold themselves to do the will of the Pope; while the other party called their opponents heretics and schismatics! The Pope’s Legates used all their arts and influence to procure the rejection of the proposition of Divine right of Bishops, as it would, it was thought, render the Bishops independent of the Pope. Many were enticed away from the meeting by the Legate, to destroy their votes. A division took place; 44 prelates voted for the Divine right and 137 against it. To believe that such a Council was presided over by the Spirit of God is to suppose all are as credulous as Dr. Newman; particularly when these same Bishops discussed the doctrine of

justification, came to blows, and two reverend gentlemen fell to tugging at each other's beards to enforce their own opinions;\* the scandal was raised to such a pitch that the Emperor Charles V. interfered, and threatened to chuck them into the Adige, if they could not behave themselves more decently. If they call this "stirring up the Holy Spirit by *laying on of hands*," the Trent Bishops were ordained for some practical purpose, and they gave *striking* and *practical* illustrations of their peculiar privileges. But the notion of a Divine right in the Episcopacy being rejected, the Roman Church, according to Dr. Newman's own theory, can have no divinely appointed Episcopacy! If the Bishops have no "Divine right," by what authority do they pretend to convey Divine graces?

I am really anxious to hear how Dr. Newman can account for all these difficulties. Is it possible that such men do reflect when they take so decided a course as to leave the Church in which they were born, educated, and ordained as ministers, to join another, on the bare allegation that there is no "orders," no *personal* Apostolic Succession in that Church? and simply because "Anglicans" do not deem "orders" a sacrament, and do not consider "Apostolic Succession" a necessary means of "transmitting grace," and because the Roman Church *professes* both these beliefs, the propositions must therefore be true, and that their Church must therefore be the only true Church! They literally have no more forcible argument than bold, impudent, unproved assertions.

Dr. Newman has succumbed to the allurements of the Great Apostasy! It has pleased God to visit him with a strong delusion that he should believe a lie. He cannot comprehend that salvation is not of man, nor by his institutions, nor by his agency, but of God alone through Christ. "Grace and truth came by Jesus Christ."† "By grace ye are saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God."‡

---

\* "Tum vero Cavensis, ut mos est iracundiâ percitis, exarsit in ultionem longè perniciosiorem ultori ipsâ injuriâ quam ultum ibat. Nam in Chironensis barbam injectâ manu, multos ex eâ pilos avulsit, et confestim abscessit."—*Pallav. Hist. Conc. Trid.*, Tom. i., p. 277. Aug. Vin., 1775.

† John i. 17.

‡ Eph. ii. 8.



